



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 25

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 35: What about the verdict of the Permanent Committee on two of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi's books?

You should know first that the matter is exactly as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) stated, which is **“the only ones who rejoiced with the fatwaa are the revolutionary takfiris”**. In the days gone by the Activists, Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, Takfiriyyah and all, would actually disdain our Ulamaa, slander them and revile them, and also reject their verdicts on a variety of different issues that related to the affairs of da'wah and manhaj. And examples of this have already preceded in previous answers.

As for the fatwaa in question, then that arose on account of certain “advisors” to the Committee who had tried numerous times to get the Committee to issue a verdict, previously. The fatwaa itself was rejected by many scholars, amongst them Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen himself.

Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh (Imaam of Masjid an-Nabawi) stated, **“How can the verdict ascribe to the Murji'ah the saying that actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan, when the Murji'ah themselves do not even consider that Imaan can be deficient to begin with, such that it is then possible for Imaan to become perfect and complete?!”**, the Shaikh outlined the error of the accusation in the fatwa. (Refer to the cassettes 'Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad al-Haramayn')

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain (a Minister of Religious Affairs from Saudi Arabia, stationed in Jordan) stated, **“As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best**

of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists.." (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn" and also "Mujmal I'tiqaad..." in which an actual photocopy of this letter is included at the beginning.)

This question was presented to Ash-Shaikh Saalih As Sadlaan the morning dated 7th of Shawwaal, 1421A.H./January 2, 2001C.E. at Masjidul Haraam.

Question: "Many of the students in the university are arguing about the fatwaa that warns against Ash-Shaikh 'Alee Al Halabee. What is your advice to us about it and what position should we take?"

Answer: **"No, this should not be applied to Ash-Shaikh 'Alee Al-Halabee**, for he is well-known to have a **sound 'aqeedah**. This fatwaa was **an improper ijtihaad** ("ijtihaadun fee ghayri mahallih"), as 'Alee is well-known to us ("ma'roof indanaa"), a good man ("rajulun tayyib"), possessor of the correct 'aqeedah ("saahibul 'aqeedah"). **My advice to you is to abandon this fatwaa ("utrakil-fatwaa tamaaman")** and focus on other things, **as it was an unsuitable and improper ijtihaad("fee ghayri mahalli")**". End of the Shaikh's reply.

Some of the students of knowledge from Yemen, from the students of Abul-Hasan al-Ma'rabi phoned Shaikh Muhammad bin Salih al-Uthaimeen – rahimahullaah - on 28th Jumaada al-Aakhirah 1421H and asked him, "What is your view concerning the fatwaa issued by the Permanent Committee concerning the two books of Shaikh Ali al-Halabi, "At-Tahdhir Min Fitnah of Takfir" and "Saihatu Nadheer" and what is your view concerning it?"

The Shaikh replied, **"I have not read the two books, and this fatwaa, I do not like the fact that it was issued, because there is within it what creates turmoil amongst the people - and my advice to the students of knowledge is they should not give any care for the fatwaa of fulaan or fulaan..."**" (Cassette: Phone Discussion With Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, Dated: 28th Jumaada al-Aakhirah 1421H)

And many others from the people of knowledge also rejected the fatwaa, including Shaikh Muhammad bin 'Abdul-Wahhaab al-Bannaa, Shaikh Saleh as-Saleh, many of the students of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen and those of Imaam Ibn Baaz. Leaving aside all of that, the position of Shaikh Ali on the subjects of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed were synonymous with those of the three Imaams of our time, anyhow.

Shaikh Ali Hasan wrote an excellent 52 page reply to the Committee's allegations which has had no reply to date (refer to MSC060008). The behaviour of the Hizbiyyoon in this whole affair was a great blessing for Ahl us-Sunnah, for it allowed them to immediately to see the opportunism and deceit inherent in their actions.

Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh also stated, during his visit to the US at the QSS conference in Chicago, when asked about this, that the verdict was not a judgement upon Shaikh Ali Hasan (as the Qutubiyyoon and Harakiyyoon portrayed it), and nor was it a judgement upon his aqeedah or manhaj. Rather, it was a discussion and contention of certain points in one of his books. And he also noted that Shaikh Ali Hasan replied with a detailed reply, which rebutted the claims. This cassette is available from those who hosted the conference and also from QSS in the states.

As for the Qutubiyyah and Hizbiyyoon, amongst the Ruwaibidah, then their slogans were altogether different. Amongst such Ruwaibid elements were the well-known Qutubists of the West, amongst them Idris Palmer¹, who rejoiced with the fatwaa stating, "Alhumdulillah, a major figurehead of this false movement has been exposed as Murjiah masquerading as Salafis" in his communication dated 16th September 2000. And Shaikh Ibn 'Uthaimeen refuted these Ruwaibidah in his well known defence of Imaam al-Albaani, and clearing him of Irjaa' and stated that it is those who are desirous of takfir and those who share with the characteristics of the munaafiqs (in their mockery of the believers) that make this accusation of Irjaa'.

In the days gone by, no heed did they pay to the verdicts of our Scholars on the books of Sayyid Qutb, his great calamities and his statements of kufr and apostasy. Most of our Scholars had spoken on this affair, including Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and many others. However, no heed did they pay, and they continued to make walaa and baraa' for the sake of a Rafidite Heretic who called for the abolition of parts of the Sharee'ah, claiming that they are no longer applicable to the current times (i.e. slavery) – and who also uttered kufr and apostasy by his mockery of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam).

No heed did they pay when their extremist form of al-Haakimiyyah was declared an innovation and anyone who spoke with it to be an Innovator. Many of them persisted and claimed it was a matter of ijtihaad and difference of opinion (and they never utilised this principle for al-Anbari or al-Halabi) whereas others, retreated in the snake burrow, and whereas previously they had assaulted Ahl us-Sunnah (merely because they did not speak with their innovation), they then, in order to save face, decided to adopt Ibn al-Qayyim's nomenclature of Tawheed, which is the Tawheed of knowledge and acquaintance and the

¹ An Extremist and Fanatical Hizbee and Qutubee, Majnoon Safar and Salman. Refer to GRV070005. His enmity to the Salafees is a matter well-known and famous. He gets angry for the sake of the neo-Qutubiyyah and their sayyid, but mockery of Moosa (alaihis-salaam) and takfir of Banu Umayyah, and the innovations of the Jahmiyyah and Ash'ariyyah and Mu'tazilah, and the call for the abolition of slavery, and revilement of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) does not anger this Fanatical Qutubee – no it is only those who speak of Safar and Salman and their Qutb who anger this diseased partisan – in Allaah is refuge from such ignorance and misguidance and extremist practical neo-Irjaa'.

Tawheedh of intent and purpose – and so in their public and private lectures began to speak with this, whereas previously, they had scorned Ahl us-Sunnah for not accepting the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb they (the Activists) had been preaching. Such people included the Qutubists of the West like Ali at-Timimi and Idris Palmer and others.

Similarly, in the days gone by they rejected the most recent and up to date verdicts of our Scholars on the groups and sects of innovation like Ikhwaan and Tabligh, and instead they promoted the very old and outdated verdicts of the Scholars, allowing co-operation with these groups. So no heed did they pay here either.

Likewise, the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanaah, which was the born-again manhaj of Hassan al-Bannaa being promoted by Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Salman al-Awdah- who have no repented from this bid'ah to date.

And many other issues. In those days, our Ulamaa were “the scholars of women’s menses”, “senile”, “present in body absent in mind”, “mummified”, “perfect ignorance” and other such slanders that came from the direction of the Political Activists.

So all of this illustrated, walhamdulillah, just as the many blunders that were made by the Qutubiyyah when they decided to come out openly with their da'wah during the Gulf War illustrated – that the Activists are upon an agenda and that their positions are being held, not due to ijtihaad and sincere following of the truth wherever it may be, but due to a party-plan and due to Hizbiyyah and other such affairs. So their behaviour during the Halabi Affair was indeed one of the greatest of blessings to Ahl us-Sunnah.

It also allowed Ahl us-Sunnah to perceive the existence of another band of partisans who had been “by-standing” over the years. When the Salafis were refuting the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and others many of these by-standers would often find fault with this, or at least remain silent and not take a position – despite their knowledge that there was indeed a concerted effort by the neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah) and their followers to promote the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. Similarly, no word of rebuke was ever heard from them when the Qutubites accused Imaam al-Albaani of the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan. In short, they sat on the fence.

However, as soon as the verdicts came on Khalid al-'Anbari and Ali Hasan al-Halabi, immediately, these band of individuals (and perhaps there many more like them in the various parts of the earth), suddenly came out and starting holding positions and began to promote these verdicts and they began to accuse the Salafis with what is unbecfitting. And some of them also bent over backwards to defend the Qutubiyyah and their partisan activities. So again, the verdict was yet another blessing in that the people of clarity, were distinguished between those who stirred in the murky waters, lurking therein in the shadows. And yet others then began to claim that Imaam al-Albaani should not be relied upon in matters of creed since he “discovered Salafiyyah” and other such claims.

As for the actual criticisms of the Committee, then some of them are really surprising indeed, and there some clear errors in the verdict – as one can see from Shaikh Ali

Hasan's reply to the Committee. Nevertheless, the Permanent Committee is loved by the Salafis, and they merely made an errant ijtihaad. But it is the Muqallidah and the Hizbiyyoon who cause turmoil and stir in the murky waters.

Finally, there are many verdicts of the PREVIOUS Permanent Committees which actually corroborate the viewpoint of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi, thus the issue is not one of acceptance or rejection of the Permanent Committee's stances, but it is an issue of proof and evidence that are brought.

In short, the Takfiris, Qutubiyyah and others latched onto this verdict on account of the support it would give to their manhaj in general – which is that of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali and others. As for the issue itself then it is one of mutual discussion and correction amongst the Salafi Mashaayikh, and so far, Shaikh Ali's response – for anyone who is not given to blind following and hawaa – is one that is to be contended with, with all due respect and veneration to the Permanent Committee.

In addition to that – this whole chapter - illustrated the way Shaikh Ali Hasan respected and venerated the Permanent Committee, compared to the disgusting behaviour of the neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah) during the Gulf War and thereafter, when they opposed the verdict of Imaam Ibn Baaz and the Permanent Committee, on a number of issues, and so they fell into insults, slanders, mockery and other such wicked behaviour, which led the youth to break their attachment to the Senior scholars. Indeed, in this there is a lesson for anyone who has understanding – and it also illustrates the difference between those who seek the truth and wish for a constructive dialogue with those who oppose them (i.e. the Salafi Mashaayikh) and between those who are upon a manhaj and who only wish to promote it, at the cost of assaulting the honour of the Major Scholars (i.e. the Qutubi Intelligentsia).